

Fields marked with an asterisk (\*) are mandatory.

## Contact details

Last name: \*

Wise

First name: \*

Lindsey

E-mail: \*

[lindsey.wise@wfp.org](mailto:lindsey.wise@wfp.org)

Name of government/organization/association if applicable: \*

UN Network for SUN Secretariat

Position within organization \*

Liaison Officer

Address of organization

Country \*

ita

Are the responses approved or endorsed by your organization?

Yes

## Comments on the "[Discussion paper](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the approach

Well done. The discussion paper was enjoyable to read and easy to understand. In the discussion paper 'Member States' is used whereas in the Introductory paper 'Government' is used. Suggest to keep language consistent across documents unless there is clear rationale.

Specific comments

Background: This section concisely walked the reader through the development process.

General principles of the approach: COI is well defined, however, in paragraph 11 it notes in the last sentence that "the perception of COI alone may create a negative image," would this also not be relevant to paragraph 10, institutional COI.

Paragraph 12: Where does the UN fit into this discussion? Under non-state institutions with NGO, private sector, philanthropic and academic all listed I find it puzzling that UN is not featured. If the argument is that the target audience of the paper is Member States and the UN is comprised of member states I find the logic faulty.

Paragraph 18: This is very clearly explained. Well done.

Paragraph 20: It mentions the assessment is done by the national authority. It might be helpful to keep terminology the same and mention member state (or government if that is used instead) or give a brief explanation.

## Comments on the "[Introductory paper](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the introductory paper

Again well done. For a topic that could be perceived as dry, this is quite interesting and engages the reader.

Specific comments

2. Scope and audience: While new to the discussion, it was my understanding that Member States requested WHO to develop this document. If so, it might be worth noting so that it is clearly understood as a bottom-up request and not a top-down demand.

4. General principles: As noted under the discussion paper, this section uses government whereas the discussion paper uses Member States. Would be helpful to keep terminology consistent.

5. Ethical, legal and regulatory instruments, (b) appropriateness of role, second paragraph - this is great to include.

Appendix 1 - the picture could be clearer, the other appendices are well appreciated.

## Comments on the "[Tool](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and practical value of the tool

The Steps highlighted are very practical and easy to follow, it really feels like thought was given to the reader. This document could have been over a hundred pages (or more) and yet it was kept to a reasonable length that really indicates it is meant to be operational. Really impressed!

Specific comments

1, a) preventive measures and b) management measures, boxes: It may be useful to provide a sentence or two of explanation for each bullet rather than just some of the bullets.

2, COI prevention ...

Figure 1, the decision tree is an excellent and easy to understand tool

Step 3, Table 2, suggest to include an additional row below Ethical Impacts that is demarcated into two columns, one that says definition and the other that says something like example so it is clear what the difference is between the two columns of each impact.